

Appl. No. 10/243,094

Amdt. Dated November 29, 2004

Reply to Office Action of November 23, 2004

- I. Species 1 corresponding to figure 1;
- II. Species 2 corresponding to figure 2;
- III. Species 3 corresponding to figure 3a;
- IV. Species 4 corresponding to figure 3b;
- V. Species 5 corresponding to figure 4;
- VI. Species 6 corresponding to figure 5a;
- VII. Species 7 corresponding to figure 5b;
- VIII. Species 8 corresponding to figure 6;
- IX. Species 9 corresponding to figure 7;
- X. Species 10 corresponding to figure 8;
- XI. Species 11 corresponding to figure 9;
- XII. Species 12 corresponding to figure 15;

The Examiner states that the Applicant is required under 35 USC 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, the Examiner avers that there are no generic claims.

Further, the Examiner states that the Applicant must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Appl. No. 10/243,094
Amdt. Dated November 29, 2004
Reply to Office Action of November 23, 2004

Furthermore, the Examiner states that should Applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case.

Applicant respectfully traverses the identification of species as provided by the Examiner for the following reasons:

1) Claims 1 -14, as submitted, have one independent Claim – namely, Claim 1. Claim 1 is drawn to a method for rendering image data on a display wherein the display comprises a repeating group of subpixels. This repeating group substantially comprises of at least one white subpixel and a plurality of colored subpixels.

2) Figures 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 5a, 5b, 7 and 8 – as may be seen – meet the claim limitation above of a subpixel repeating group substantially comprising a white subpixel and a plurality of colored subpixels.

3) Figures 4, 6, 9 and 15 are figures that are embodiments of filter kernels and resample areas that are subsumed under the scope of Claim 1 – hence, all of the dependent claims.

As such, Applicant respectfully avers that Claim 1 is generic to all of the noted species listed by the Examiner.

Appl. No. 10/243,094
Amdt. Dated November 29, 2004
Reply to Office Action of November 23, 2004

Heeding the Examiner's admonition, however, that no response is complete without an election of a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits, Applicant hereby selects Species 7. As such, Applicant identifies Claims 1-14 as applying to Species 7.

However, Applicant would appreciate the Examiner to remark as to Applicant's traversal stated herein. Applicant believes that the method claim of Claim 1 encompasses all layouts comprising a repeating subpixel grouping further substantially comprising of at least one white subpixel and a plurality of colored subpixels.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite the allowance of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact Stuart P. Kaler at (707) 824-2487.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6 June 2005

By: Stuart P. Kaler
Stuart P. Kaler
Reg. No. 35, 913